3 Telephone: (916) 779-7000 MAY 1 1 2016 Facsimile: (916) 721-2501 4 Email: ian@kctlegal.com 5 Call Eng Board Util Attorneys for Respondent 6 7 8 **BOARD OF ADMINISTRATION** 9 CALIFORNIA PUBLIC EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT SYSTEM 10 In the Matter of the Appeal Regarding Case No. 2015-0373 11 Death Benefits Payable Upon the Death of OAH No. 2015081045 GRANTLAND LEE JOHNSON by 12 13 RESPONDENT LEE TURNER LEE TURNER JOHNSON, JOHNSON'S REQUEST FOR 14 INTRODUCTION OF EVIDENCE NOT CONTAINED IN THE ADMINISTRATIVE Respondent. 15 RECORD 16 17 Hearing Date: May 18, 2016 Hearing Location: CalPERS Headquarters 18 Robert F. Carlson Auditorium 19 Respondent Lee Turner Johnson ("Respondent" or "Mrs. Johnson") seeks to introduce four declarations not included in the Administrative Record as evidence on an issue that never 20 arose in the underlying proceedings, namely the legitimacy or validity or Grantland Johnson's 21 marriage to Lee Turner Johnson and whether any "deathbed marriage" may have induced a 22 "deathbed election" by Grantland Johnson. Three of these declarations are attached hereto as 23 Exhibit A to this Request. The declarations of Messrs. Bill Camp, Robert J. Slobe and Leron Lee 24 constitute clear and relevant evidence that Grantland Johnson's efforts to designate Mrs. Johnson 25 as his beneficiary to his CalPERS medical, dental and option 2 benefits were not the product of a 26 deathbed election. Rather, they help establish that he clearly intended that she receive these 27 28 benefits. -1-

RESPONDENT'S REQUEST FOR INTRODUCTION OF EVIDENCE NOT CONTAINED IN THE ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD

Received

1

2

Ian J. Barlow (State Bar No. 262213) KERSHAW, COOK & TALLEY PC

Sacramento, California 95864

401 Watt Avenue

In addition to the three attached declarations, Mrs. Johnson seeks to introduce the declaration of the Honorable Kimberly J. Mueller. Counsel for Mrs. Johnson contacted Judge Mueller and she advised that the judicial canons prevent her from volunteering a declaration in this matter. However, Mrs. Johnson's counsel served a subpoena on Judge Mueller on Thursday May 5, 2016 seeking a declaration from her to the extent that it provides additional facts or clarification on the validity of the marriage between Grantland Johnson and Mrs. Johnson—Judge Mueller presided over their marriage—or his related intent to designate Mrs. Johnson as his beneficiary for CalPERS medical, dental and option 2 benefits. The Declaration of Honorable Kimberly J. Mueller is attached hereto as Exhibit B.

A. CalPERS Raised The Issue Of Deathbed Elections And Deathbed Marriages For The First Time In Its Closing Brief.

It was not until CalPERS submitted its Closing Brief on December 18, 2015, and over two months after the October 6, 2015 hearing before Administrative Law Judge Coren D. Wong, that CalPERS for the first time raised issues pertaining to "deathbed elections" and "deathbed marriages" in this matter. (CalPERS Closing Br. at p. 11 (invoking the legislative intent of Government Code section 21462 as evidence that the Legislature was concerned with "deathbed elections").) Respondent seeks to introduce evidence to demonstrate that CalPERS' eleventh hour reliance on this legislative intent and any notion of impropriety underlying the marriage between Grantland Johnson and Mrs. Johnson is entirely unfounded and misplaced in this case. Mrs. Johnson did not previously obtain these declarations as they were not necessary prior to CalPERS filing its Closing Brief, which raised this issue for the first time.

It is a fundamental principal of our judicial system that parties should be afforded the opportunity to respond to new arguments raised for the first time in a closing brief. (See El Pollo Loco v. Hashim (9th Cir. 2003) 316 F.3d 1032, 1040-41 (permitting opposing party an opportunity to respond to a new argument raised in the reply brief).) Here, CalPERS improperly made a new argument in its Closing Brief insinuating that Grantland Johnson made a deathbed election and therefore, Mrs. Johnson's claim for his lifetime option 2 benefits should be denied. She should clearly be afforded the opportunity to respond to this new argument. The attached

declarations rebut CalPERS' argument that Grantland Johnson attempted to appoint Mrs. Johnson as his beneficiary on his deathbed or pursuant to a "deathbed marriage." CalPERS' argument plainly attempts to call into question the legitimacy of their marriage and Grantland Johnson's intent to designate Mrs. Johnson as a beneficiary of his CalPERS benefits.

B. These Declarations Are Highly Relevant To Demonstrate That Grantland Johnson Was Not Induced To Name Lee Turner Johnson As His Beneficiary.

Relevant evidence is any evidence "having any tendency in reason to prove or disprove any disputed fact that is of consequence to the determination of the action." (Evid. Code, § 210.) Administrative courts have an even broader scope, where "[a]ny relevant evidence shall be admitted if it is the sort of evidence on which responsible persons are accustomed to rely in the conduct of serious affairs, regardless of the existence of any common law or statutory rule which might make improper the admission of the evidence over objection in civil actions." (Gov. Code, § 11513, subd. (c); *Donley v. Davi* (2009) 180 Cal.App.4th 447, 461-62 [103 Cal.Rptr.3d 1].)

In its Closing Brief, CalPERS raised the possibility that Grantland Johnson was somehow induced on his deathbed into designating or attempting to designate Mrs. Johnson as the beneficiary of his option 2 lifetime benefits. The attached declarations directly relate to that assertion and seek to prove the legitimacy of the marriage between Grantland Johnson and Lee Turner Johnson. By questioning the motives behind Grantland Johnson's marriage to Mrs. Johnson, CalPERS also suggests that the intent behind Grantland Johnson's efforts to designate Mrs. Johnson as his CalPERS beneficiary was also obscured or untowardly influenced. Accordingly, the declarations help demonstrate Grantland Johnson's clear and manifest intentions to name Mrs. Johnson as the beneficiary of his lifetime option 2 benefits.

C. The Declarations Evidence Grantland Johnson's Intent And Are Admissible

As discussed above, administrative courts have wide latitude in the evidence allowed. Not only are the attached declarations permissible under the broad scope granted in administrative hearings, but Evidence Code section 1251 permits hearsay evidence to show a declarant's state of mind "including a statement of intent [or] plan" if the declarant is now unavailable and the "evidence is offered to prove such prior state of mind . . . when it is itself an issue in the action

•	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
	11

and the evidence is not offered to prove any fact other than such state of mind" (Evid. Code, § 1251.)

There is no doubt that Grantland Johnson's intent is at issue in this action. CalPERS itself argued in its Closing Brief that Grantland Johnson's intent was "speculate[ve]" and "unascertainable." (CalPERS Closing Br. at 21.) Furthermore, it is undisputed that Grantland Johnson is unavailable. Grantland Johnson died on August 19, 2014. The four attached declarations evidence the declarants' impressions of Grantland Johnson's marriage to Mrs. Johnson and describe conversations each of the declarants had with Grantland Johnson regarding his marriage and intent to name Mrs. Johnson as the beneficiary of his medical, dental and option 2 lifetime benefits. In fact, declarant Honorable Kimberly J. Mueller presided over their wedding. Declarant Robert J. Slobe served as a witness to their marriage. Grantland Johnson did not make a deathbed designation, as insinuated by CalPERS, and these declarations are clearly admissible under the California Evidence Code to demonstrate Mr. Johnson's intent.

For the foregoing reasons, Respondent seeks to have the attached declarations introduced as evidence before the Board.

Date: May 6, 2016.

Respectfully submitted,

KERSHAW, COOK & TALLEY, PC

By:

Ian J. Barlow Counsel for Respondent

	II .		
1	Ian J. Barlow (State Bar No. 262213)		
2	KERSHAW, COOK & TALLEY PC 401 Watt Avenue		
3	Sacramento, California 95864 Telephone: (916) 779-7000		
4	Facsimile: (916) 721-2504 Email: ian@kctlegal.com		
5			
6	Attorneys for Respondent		
7			
8	BOARD OF	A DMINICTD A TION	
9	BOARD OF ADMINISTRATION CALIFORNIA PUBLIC EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT SYSTEM		
10		LOYEES RETIREMENT SYSTEM	
11	In the Matter of the Appeal Regarding Death Benefits Payable Upon the Death of	Case No. 2015-0373 OAH No. 2015081045	
12	GRANTLAND LEE JOHNSON by	20.001013	
13	LEE TURNER JOHNSON,	NOTICE OF DECLARATION AND	
14		DECLARATION OF BILL CAMP	
15	Respondent.		
16			
17	NOTICE OF DECLARATION		
18	The declaration of Bill Camp set forth below will be introduced as evidence in In the		
19	Matter of the Appeal Regarding Death Benej	its Payable Upon Death of Grantland Lee Johnson	
20	by Lee Turner Johnson, Respondent, Ref. No. 2015-0373.		
21	///		
22	111		
23	111		
24	111		
25	111		
26	111		
27	111		
28	111		
		-1-	

NOTICE OF DECLARATION AND DECLARATION OF BILL CAMP

DECLARATION OF BILL CAMP

I, Bill Camp, declare as follows:

- 1. I have personal knowledge of the matters set forth in this declaration. If called upon as a witness I would be competent to do so, and could and would testify as to the truth of the facts below. I give this declaration freely and in support of Respondent Lee Turner Johnson's appeal of the California Public Employment Retirement System's ("CalPERS") denial of Grantland Johnson's Option 2 lifetime monthly benefits to Lee Turner Johnson.
- 2. I was a close personal friend of Grantland Johnson. I first met him in or around 1978 and was involved in his first campaign for Sacramento City Council. I was involved in his successful campaign for the Sacramento County Board of Supervisors as well, including as Executive Secretary of the Sacramento Central Labor Council, AFL-CIO.
- 3. I was also close to him at the time he started dating Lee Turner Johnson. He was obviously smitten and it was clear to me that he had found the love of his life. Lee filled a void in Grantland Johnson's life and it was undoubtedly a good thing; it was nice to watch their relationship blossom. In his relationship with Lee, I saw an emotional brightness in his life that I had not seen in a long time. He was committed to her, and she was committed to him. They had a deep relationship.
- 4. We remained in close contact through the time that he married Lee Turner Johnson, and up until the end of his life. I attended a wedding ceremony for Grantland Johnson and Lee Turner Johnson on December 8, 2013 at Biba Restaurant in Sacramento. I also spoke at his funeral.
- 5. Grantland Johnson was determined to do whatever he could to make sure that Lee Turner Johnson was secure and provided for, particularly through his pension benefits. I have no doubt that he wanted her to have whatever he had in his CalPERS pension. I can say without equivocation that he wanted to make sure that Lee Turner Johnson had all of his CalPERS benefits as his beneficiary.
- 6. Grantland Johnson also expressed frustration at his former wife, Charlot Bolton's, refusal and delay in finalizing their divorce and marital property settlement papers, which would

award Grantland Johnson full interest in his CalPERS pension benefits. He believed that she was unfairly holding up the process. However, there is no question that he did not want the existing beneficiaries to receive his CalPERS benefits and wanted to designate Lee Turner Johnson as his new beneficiary. He made that clear to me.

- 7. We never discussed the plans that he had for his CalPERS benefits with the understanding that his death was in any way imminent or that he was making arrangements believing that he would soon die. Rather, these were arrangements that he wanted to make in part as a recognition of his marriage to Lee Turner Johnson.
- 8. Grantland Johnson never represented to me that there was anyone else other than Lee Turner Johnson whom he wanted to designate as his new beneficiary for CalPERS benefits.
- 9. Based on my knowledge of Grantland Johnson and his relationship with Lee Turner Johnson, it is my firm belief that Grantland Johnson intended for Lee Turner Johnson to be designated as his beneficiary for his medical, dental and Option 2 lifetime monthly benefits.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed this 5th day of May 2016, at Sagrament California.

BILL CAMP

1	Ian J. Barlow (State Bar No. 262213)		
2	KERSHAW, COOK & TALLEY PC 401 Watt Avenue		
3	Sacramento, California 95864 Telephone: (916) 779-7000		
4	Facsimile: (916) 721-2504		
5	Email: ian@kctlegal.com		
6	Attorneys for Respondent		
7			
8	DO ADD OF		
9	BOARD OF ADMINISTRATION		
10	a	LOYEES' RETIREMENT SYSTEM	
11	In the Matter of the Appeal Regarding Death Benefits Payable Upon the Death of	Case No. 2015-0373 OAH No. 2015081045	
12	GRANTLAND LEE JOHNSON by	0711110.2013001043	
13	I FE TUDNED IOIDIGON	NOTICE OF DECLARATION AND	
14	LEE TURNER JOHNSON,	DECLARATION OF ROBERT J. SLOBE	
15	Respondent.		
16			
17	NOTICE OF DECLARATION		
18	The declaration of Robert J. Slobe set forth below will be introduced as evidence in In the		
19	Matter of the Appeal Regarding Death Bene,	fits Payable Upon Death of Grantland Lee Johnson	
20	by Lee Turner Johnson, Respondent, Ref. No.	2015-0373.	
21	111		
22	111		
23	111		
24	111		
25	111		
26	111		
27	///		
28	///		
		-1-	
1	NOTICE OF DECLARATION AND DECLARATION OF ROBERT J. SLOBE		

I, Robert J. Slobe, declare as follows:

2

3 4

5

7

6

9

8

10 11

12

13 14

15 16

17

18 19

20

2.1 22

23

24

25 26

27

28

5.

I have personal knowledge of the matters set forth in this declaration. If called 1. upon as a witness I would be competent to do so, and could and would testify as to the truth of the facts below. I give this declaration freely and in support of Respondent Lee Turner Johnson's appeal of the California Public Employment Retirement System's ("CalPERS") denial of Grantland Johnson's Option 2 lifetime monthly benefits to Lee Turner Johnson.

- 2. I was a close personal friend of Grantland Johnson. I first met him in the mid-1980s. We both grew up in the same part of Sacramento. We got together often, shared a love of jazz music, and on numerous occasions traveled together with our spouses to the Monterey Jazz Festival.
- I was close with him at the time he started dating Lee Turner Johnson, as well as 3. when they married. In fact, I was a witness to their marriage and my name appears as a witness on their marriage certificate.
- I would not have served as a witness to their marriage if I thought that their 4. marriage was in any way disingenuous or a sham. It was not. It was clear to me that they loved each other and that they married because they loved each other.
- I remained close personal friends with Grantland Johnson as his health declined. I drove him to dialysis appointments. I was also at his funeral and his burial.
- As his health declined, I personally saw Lee Turner Johnson devote herself almost 6. entirely to his well-being. She tirelessly advocated for him and dedicated significant time and effort to helping him in any way that she could, including through multiple surgeries, ongoing medical appointments and treatments. I just don't believe that she would have endured those extremely difficult and distressing experiences simply to obtain CalPERS benefits as Grantland Johnson's beneficiary.
- However, I remember that Grantland Johnson wanted Lee Turner Johnson to 7. receive whatever CalPERS benefits that he had. I have no doubt that Grantland Johnson wanted her to be designated as beneficiary for his full CalPERS benefits.

- 8. We never discussed the plans that he had for his CalPERS benefits with the understanding that his death was in any way imminent or that he was making arrangements believing that he would soon die. Rather, these were arrangements that he wanted to make in part as a recognition of his marriage to Lee Turner Johnson.
- Grantland Johnson never represented to me that there was anyone else other than
 Lee Turner Johnson whom he wanted to designate as his new beneficiary for CalPERS benefits.
- 10. Based on my knowledge of Grantland Johnson and his relationship with Lee Turner Johnson, it is my firm belief that Grantland Johnson intended for Lee Turner Johnson to be designated as his beneficiary for all of his CalPERS benefits.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed this \(\frac{1}{2}\) day of May 2016, at \(\frac{2}{2}\)? \(\frac{1}{2}\). California.

ROBERT J. SLOBE

1	Ian J. Barlow (State Bar No. 262213)			
2	KERSHAW, COOK & TALLEY PC			
	401 Watt Avenue Sacramento, California 95864			
3	Telephone: (916) 779-7000 Facsimile: (916) 721-2504			
4	Email: ian@ketlegal.com			
5	Attorneys for Respondent			
6	a a			
7	a.			
8	BOARD OF ADMINISTRATION			
9	CALIFORNIA PUBLIC EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT SYSTEM			
10	In the Matter of the Appeal Regarding	Case No. 2015-0373		
11	Death Benefits Payable Upon the Death of GRANTLAND LEE JOHNSON by	OAH No. 2015081045		
12	SIGNATED BELVOINGOIN by			
13	LEE TURNER JOHNSON,	NOTICE OF DECLARATION AND DECLARATION OF LERON LEE		
14				
15	Respondent.			
16 17	Nomich or			
		F DECLARATION		
18		rth below will be introduced as evidence in In the		
19		fits Payable Upon Death of Grantland Lee Johnson		
20	by Lee Turner Johnson, Respondent, Ref. No.	2015-0373.		
21				
22	///			
23	///			
24	///			
25	///			
26	///			
27	***			
28	111			
	-1- Notice of Declaration and Declaration of Leron Lee			
I				

1. I have personal knowledge of the matters set forth in this declaration. If called upon as a witness I would be competent to do so, and could and would testify as to the truth of the facts below. I give this declaration freely and in support of Respondent Lee Turner Johnson's appeal of the California Public Employment Retirement System's ("CalPERS") denial of Grantland Johnson's Option 2 lifetime monthly benefits to Lee Turner Johnson.

DECLARATION OF LERON LEE

- 2. I was a close personal friend of Grantland Johnson. We had known each other since kindergarten and played football and baseball together in high school. We remained in close contact throughout his life. We were like brothers. I attended a wedding ceremony for Grantland Johnson and Lee Turner Johnson on December 8, 2013 at Biba Restaurant in Sacramento, which was held after they married on November 15, 2013.
- 3. We got together often, including in the final years of his life. We sometimes met three to four days per week and attempted to meet at least once a week at the Tower Café in Sacramento.
- 4. As part of those meetings, Grantland Johnson and I generally discussed events in each other's lives. These discussions included Grantland Johnson's efforts to make sure that his wife, Lee Turner Johnson, was taken care of and would be able to enjoy medical, dental and financial benefits related to his CalPERS pension.
- 5. On several occasions throughout 2013 and early- and mid-2014, Grantland Johnson expressed to me that he wanted Lee Turner Johnson to receive whatever CalPERS benefits he had. Although I was aware of Grantland Johnson's ongoing health issues, particularly in the form of diabetes and heart problems, we never discussed the plans that he had for his CalPERS benefits with the understanding that his death was in any way imminent or that he was making arrangements believing that he would soon die. Rather, these were arrangements that he wanted to make in part as a recognition of his marriage to Lee Turner Johnson.
 - 6. Grantland Johnson never represented to me that there was anyone else other than

Lee Turner Johnson whom he wanted to designate as his new beneficiary for CalPERS benefits.

7. Based on my knowledge of Grantland Johnson and his relationship with Lee
Turner Johnson, it is my firm belief that Grantland Johnson intended for Lee Turner Johnson to
be designated as his beneficiary for his medical, dental and lifetime option 2 benefits.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed this 4 day of May 2016, at Science California.

LERON LEE

DECLARATION OF KIMBERLY J. MUELLER

- 1. I have personal knowledge of the matters set forth in this declaration, which I am providing in response to the subpoena served on me by Ian J. Barlow, counsel for Lee Turner Johnson. If called as a witness I would be competent to testify, and could and would testify as to the truth of the matters set forth below.
- 2. I was a close personal friend of Grantland L. Johnson. We first met on election night in November 1982, when I was assigned to walk precincts with Grantland in Oak Park. From that night on, we stayed in close touch. I walked many precincts with him in each of his own elections, to the Sacramento City Council and the Sacramento County Board of Supervisors. After I was elected to the Sacramento City Council in 1987, when Grantland then served on the Board of Supervisors, he was my closest friend and confidante in the political arena. After he and I each left elected office, we continued to stay in close communication, seeing each other socially at least several times a year. In the last five years or so before Grantland's death, my husband and I would attend the Monterey Jazz Festival with Grantland. In the last several years before his death, Grantland's partner Lee Turner was with him every time we socialized together, and she attended the Festival with us.
- 3. Once Grantland's first marriage was dissolved, he formally asked Lee to marry him, and shortly thereafter the two of them asked me to officiate as they took their wedding vows. Because I am a federal trial judge, California law gives me the authority to solemnize marriages in this state. I preside over wedding ceremonies occasionally, and typically only for close friends and family that I know well enough to feel that the ceremony is authentic. Grantland and Lee first wanted an intimate, private ceremony, and so I officiated over that ceremony held in my chambers midday on November 15, 2013. During the ceremony Grantland and Lee each shared deeply personal and spontaneous statements of affection, love and respect for each other. My husband Bob Slobe witnessed the marriage and I signed the marriage certificate. After the ceremony, the four of us had a light lunch together in my chambers.
- 4. To share their wedding with friends and family, Grantland and Lee held a public ceremony with a dinner at Biba restaurant on the evening of December 8, 2013. I also presided over this ceremony, at which we recreated in part the official ceremony held previously in my chambers.

Continued . . .

- 5. I would not have presided over either the official private or the celebratory public wedding ceremony of Grantland Johnson and Lee Turner if I believed their marriage was a sham. I in fact believe their marriage was completely valid, and Grantland very much wanted Lee to be his lawful wedded wife.
- 6. Although I believe Grantland and Lee thought they would have more time together than they did, Grantland's health deteriorated precipitously in the summer of 2014. After Grantland was admitted to the hospital, I visited him regularly. Every time I was there I saw Lee acting as his zealous patient advocate, and personally doing every imaginable thing she could to ensure he received every treatment available, that his pain was managed and that his life was extended. On one occasion, because Lee had been by Grantland's side nonstop without sleep for days on end, I relieved her and stayed overnight with Grantland so that she could go home for one night to shower and rest before returning. Whenever I saw Grantland during this difficult time, although he was in pain often, he was alert and keenly aware of his circumstances. At one point when I was in his hospital room with Grantland and Lee, I personally saw Grantland sign one document providing that Lee would be his beneficiary with respect to any benefits to which he was entitled under the CalPERS system. While Grantland's ability to sign was somewhat compromised by his condition and the IV tubes attached to his arm, the signature was his and I believe he intended to sign with knowledge of what he was signing.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed this 6th day of May, 2016, at Sacramento, California.

Kimberly J. Mueller

muler